



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/356,086	07/16/1999	SETH REDMORE	FORE-56	7325	
7:	7590 03/12/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
ANSEL M SCHWARTZ ONE STERLING PLAZA			WRIGHT, NORMAN M		
201 N CRAIG STREET SUITE 304			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
PITTSBURGH	, PA 15213		2134	10	
			DATE MAILED: 03/12/200	1 1	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

h

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summan	09/356,086	REDMORE, SETH			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Norman M. Wright	2134			
	n appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address			
AILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days criod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by the ceived by the Office later than three months after the	ION. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a on. i, a reply within the statutory minimum of thi period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
desponsive to communication(s) filed on	20 February 2004.				
<u> </u>					
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
n of Claims					
a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with the state of the above claim(s) is/are allowed. claim(s) <u>1-3,13 and 14</u> is/are rejected. claim(s) <u>4-12 and 15-20</u> is/are objected to	hdrawn from consideration. o.				
n Papers					
ne specification is objected to by the Exa	ıminer.				
ne drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)] accepted or b) ☐ objected to	by the Examiner.			
pplicant may not request that any objection t	o the drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
•					
cknowledgment is made of a claim for fo All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority document Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International B	ments have been received. ments have been received in A priority documents have been ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	received in this National Stage	ッ		
. /					
	4) Interview	Summary (PTO-413)			
of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 tion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S	8) Paper No(5B/08) 5) Notice of I	s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)			
	REPLY RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR FAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days end for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by hy received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Responsive to communication(s) filled on this action is FINAL. 2b) Seeponsive to communication for all allosed in accordance with the practice under the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Responsive to communication(s) filled on this action is FINAL. 2b) Seeponsive to communication for all allosed in accordance with the practice under the patent seepons is seed in accordance with the practice under the patent seepons is seed in accordance with the practice under the patent seepons is seed to see a see a seepons is seepons in the application of the above claim(s) is seepons in the application of the seepons is seed to be seepons in the patent seepons in the patent seepons is seed to be seepons in the patent seepons of the priority document of the patent seepons in the priority document seepons of the certified copies of the priority document seepons of the certified copies of the priority document seepons of the certified copies of the papelication from the International Best the attached detailed Office action for the papelication from the International Best the attached detailed Office action for the patent seepons in the priority document seepons in the priority document seepons in the priority document seepons in	Office Action Summary Description Descr	Office Action Summary Separate September Septe		

Application/Control Number: 09/356,086 Page 2

Art Unit: 2134

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is to long and exceeds the maximum allowable limit (150 words). Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-3 and 13-14, are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Abraham et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,983,270, hereinafter '270, and further in view of "Web Security, A step by step reference guide," by Lincoln D. Stein, hereinafter Stein.
- 3. As to claims 1-2 and 13, '270 teaches the claimed invention comprising: a method and system for secure telecomunications having an internal and external network, a switch/router, a first and second inspection engine/ firewalls(internal & external filtering modules), determining traffic, processing of traffic for continue transmission or prevention, a first and second destinations, see providing access control..(figs. 1 and 2), monitoring network traffic...(50, 52, 54, and col. 2, lines 13 et seq., and lines 31-36, and col. 5, lines 25-60); ...data packet are non-intrusive...(col. 13, lines 20-23). As to the ...individual node to node transmission...(figs. 2, 3A, 9A-9D, col.

Application/Control Number: 09/356,086

Art Unit: 2134

5, lines 25-30, col. 6, lines 47-54 et seq., and col. 7, lines 15-25 et seq.); ...identififying source and destinations information...(figs. 8E, 8J, 8L, 9A-9D, 21, col. 7, lines 15-25 et seq., and col. 11, lines 13 et seq.,) and applying access rules/routing...(abst., figs. 2, 3A [50, 62,72,76,78], 4[50], 5, 7A-7C, 8E, 9A-12, 15A-118, col. 2, lines 13-35 et seq., col. 5, lines 54-59 et seq., col. 6, lines 25-36 et seq., col. 7, lines 38-65 et seq., col.8, lines 13-25 et seq., col. 9,lines 55 et seq., col. 11, lines 1 et seq.). '270 invention is practiced in the environment of LANs and WANs, which utilizes the TCP/IP Protocol or other protocols and provide for internal and external networks. Not explicitly taught is not have the inspection engines in the line of the internet and intranet.

4. Stein teaches typical network topologies for network security and packet transmission comprising: a firewall, routers, servers, proxies, and gateways for transmitting assembled packet information to and from destinations and sources that are,outside the direct path..., or a ...workstation... see (pages 389-391 et seq., 394-396, 399, 402-405, figs. 14.4-14.7, pages 406-411).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to augment the invention of '270 with one of the typical network configurations as disclosed by Stein. One of ordinary skill in the art would have realized that the actual topolography of a network system, and in particular the placment of its packtet routers, and firewalls, is a function of how well an administrator wants to secure his nework.

Based upon that and other considerations one of ordinary skill in the art would choosen a network configuration that supports what type of packets if any, traffic are allowed to pass through, as well as to what destinations. A person of ordinary skill in the art would

have been motivated, to utilize one of the conventional network configuration such as a screened subnetwork or similar type as taught by Stein. Because the use of this type of network allows for selected packets from particular destinations, sources and type/context to pass through the network without going directly through a path that is between the source and destination nodes. By using a screened subnet one would allow the routers to grant acces to certain proxies and servers that are not in the direct path between the source and destination, thereby improving the throughput and establishing secure monitoring of packet transmissions between said nodes.

As to claims 3 and 14, it is notoriously well known that the internet/external firewall has it traffice entering through a different port, than the intranet/internal firewall, see the router in Stein pages 402-405.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 5. Claims 4-12, and 15-20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 6. New corrected drawings are required in this application because allowable subject matter has been indicated. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsperson outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Art Unit: 2134

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, and 13-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Norman M. Wright at telephone number (703) 305-9586.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Norman M. Wright whose telephone number is (703) 305-9586. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays from 8am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse, can be reached on (703) 308-4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7240. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900

NORMANM WRIGHT PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 5